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PRESIDENT WILSON TO FACE A REPUBLICAN CONGRESS

President Wilson’s appeal for the unconditional surrender of partisanship in politics has been answered by the country, but with implications and under conditions capable of almost as many interpretations as there are party-managed local national leaders, and others who can command a newspaper circulation. The need for Wilson’s leadership, and wish me to continue as your unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad,” wrote the President in a general appeal to his “fellow countrymen” on October 25. “I earnestly beg that you will express yourself unmistakably to that effect by returning a Democratic majority to both the Senate and the House of Representatives.” A Republican majority in the House, and apparently also in the Senate, is the answer, but, even in the moment of victory, the New York Evening Sun (Ind.) cautions these new Republican members:

“They are not put in power by the people to run muck against the President or the Democracy. They are not set to Washington to undo anything that has been well done. Above all, they are not chosen to obstruct or harass the Administration in any way.

“Tlicir mandate is to add their energy and their effort to those of the President and his advisers.”

The Republican New York Tribune accepts the Republican success rather as a “rebuke” to the President’s desire for a complete subordination of the legislative branch to the will and mind of the Executive” than as a repudiation of Mr. Wilson’s leadership, and both independent and Democratic organs are in the second stock of the opinion that the country’s Republican answer to Wilson’s request for approval applies to matters less vital than the Presidential leadership. Says the New York Globe (R.I.)

“The election, altho it repudiates the proposition that it is improper for any citizen to differ with the President in a domain of ideas and that all Americanism and wisdom are in his head, is not a repudiation of the war-policy of the Administration or even of its peace policy, now that he has ceased to hand playing and consented to clarifying interpretations in fourteen articles.”

An “all-American Senate and House” is the one result generally admitted, with mutual felicitations, by Republicans, independents, and Democrats alike. “I consider it a victory for Americanism rather than for Republicanism,” declared Mr. Roosevelt, in his after-election statement, and the New York World (Dem.) publishes tidings of the same import from its Washington correspondent. Even in the case of this one point of agreement, however, some are pointing out that Victor Berger (Socialist) of Wisconsin, under indictment for war-obstruction, has been elected over his more patriotic opponents, and, in the words of the Democratic New York Times, “Senator Norris (Republican), of Nebraska, is borne back to the Senate in the rejoicing arms of the solid pro-German vote.”

Republican explanations of their own success fall generally under the head of their unqualified support of the war, including a policy of unconditional surrender. The state of opinion in the West, where the swing from Democracy to Republicanism was one of the surprising features of a generally surprising election, is indicated in some measure by frequent editorials calling for that same “unconditional surrender” which was to come sooner than any of the editors seemed to suspect. Says the Denver Rocky Mountain News (Ind.), one of the papers which feared most the “fruits of victory might be lost by diplomacy”:

“If President Wilson had gone into the innermost vault of the Treasury building and filled his ears with insulated cotton he would have heard the sound of the American Voice. . . . . . .

“That vibrant Voice spoke in measured terms against note-writing or having dealings with a government and a people that had committed the Unpardonable Sin. It warned Diplomacy that it must not turn into Duplicity or there would be a terrible accounting.

“The Voice was heard in New England and it gathered strength and took its way out across the nation, into the great manufacturing cities, into the prairie States, out into the West and over the Rocky Mountain regions to the Pacific coast. As it passed with the swiftness of lightning it said in a single American sentence, ‘Unconditional Surrender!’”

An English interpretation, following this current of American
threw up the sponge on September 30 and gave the Allies full military use of her territory and means of transportation. Almost exactly a month later, at noon on the 31st of October, the terms of the armistice between Turkey and the Allies went into effect. They were described by Lord Robert Cecil as “complete and unconditional surrender,” and Turkey was at once reduced to military impotence. The Dardanelles and the Bosporus with their fortifications were opened to the Allies, who entered Constantinople a few days later. All Allied prisoners were to be handed over to the Allies without reciprocity; the Turkish Army was demobilized, and the Navy surrendered. Turkish troops were to withdraw from northern Persia and other occupied non-Turkish territory. The Allies were given the use of all means of transportation and communication; all garrisons in Arabia, Syria, and Mesopotamia were to be surrendered. Turkey was to cease all relations with the Central Powers; the Allies were, of course, given such rights and facilities as were necessary to enforce all the provisions of the armistice.

The collapse of Turkey gave the Allies at once a new responsibility, as the Newark News points out. There are four million utterly destitute people whom we must care for and several new nations which must be started on the road to self-government. The great and crying need of the situation, says the New York Evening Post, is that these races be given the assurance at the peace table that they will have the separate and independent political life they have for generations been fighting for. France and Great Britain have officially stated that their aim “is the complete and final liberation of the peoples so long oppressed by the Turks and the establishment of governments and administrations deriving their authority from the initiative and the free choice of the native populations,” and have announced that they are holding out and helping the establishment of native governments in Syria and Mesopotamia.

American responsibility in the old Turkish Empire is recognized by a number of authorities. A former American Ambassador to Turkey, Mr. Oscar S. Straus, thinks “it will be to the welfare of the Turkish people if Turkey would be apportioned among England, France, and Italy, and be ruled in the same manner as Egypt is ruled.” Another former American representative at the Porte, Mr. Henry Morgenthau, has publicly asserted that America must play a large part in rebuilding Turkey. Dr. James L. Barton, a missionary authority on the Near East, hears that Visscount Bryce favors the United States taking the major part in reorganizing and reshaping the government of Turkey, Bulgaria, and the Balkan peninsula. For one thing, says Dr. Barton, this nation is not suspected of colonial ambitions in that part of the world, and would not be likely to stir up jealousy. Furthermore, “there is no country in the world which stands so close to Turkey as does the United States, as a result of missionary work which it has done there.”

Austria’s defeat in the field at the hands of the Italians and their Allies was accompanied by the break-up of the Hapsburg Empire and appearance of the red flag in Vienna, Budapest, and other Austro-Hungarian cities. Austria was in no condition to object to the drastic terms submitted to her, altho Emperor Charles refused to sign them as humiliating and dishonorable, and the armistice finally received the signature of the Austrian Chief of Staff. The Austrian terms, which went into effect on November 4, included the cessation of hostilities, the demobilization of the Austrian Army, the withdrawal of all forces on the Italian front, and the surrender of half the Austrian military equipment. Besides evacuating invaded territory, Austria was to withdraw from the Trentino and part of the Tyrol, and from Istria, Dalmatia, and most of the Adriatic islands. Thus the cisleitan is in Italy’s grasp and the Allies control the shores of the Adriatic. The armistice gave the Allies free use of all roads, railways, and waterways in Austria and the control of all necessary strategic points. As in the case of Turkey, Austria was obliged to give up all Allied prisoners without reciprocity. The naval conditions of the armistice included the surrender of most of the Austrian Navy and the laying up of the rest, and the freedom of Allied navigation in Austrian waters, without any modification of the Allied blockade.

The New York Tribune remarks that “it was learned that in the last Italian offensive Austria had lost 130,000 men in prisoners alone and not less than 5,000 guns. The retreat developed into a rout, and after the armistice was signed dispatches told how for many days the hungry, disorderly soldiers of what was once the Austrian Army poured through the passes of the Alps, while the citizens of Vienna feared that they would sweep down into the capital as a destroying mob.

It has been difficult to keep up with the dissolution and democratization of the Austrian Empire. The most important fact is the split into Hungarian, German, Czech, and Slov nations. In Hungary, Count Tisza, the former Premier and a leader in the movement which brought on the war, was assassinated by soldiers, according to one story, in his own home. Count Karolyi, whose grandmother’s famous curse on the Hapsburg has found complete fulfillment, seems to have resigned his leadership of the new Hungarian Government and a plebiscite is promised to determine the permanent government régime. Both Czechoslovaks and Jugo-Slavs have adopted the republican form of government and have elected presidents. In Bulgaria, King Boris, who succeeded his father, Ferdinand, on the latter’s abdication, was deposed after a few weeks’ reign and made way for an autocratic republic headed by the peasant leader Stambuliski.

In German Austria a socialist republic was proclaimed, altho there seemed to be no great haste in getting rid of Emperor Charles. The New York Tribune reminds us that German Austria is itself as much of a mosaic as was the Austrian Empire. Vienna may be “red,” but the Tyrol and upper Austria are even more “antisocialist and monarchical,” serving “as a makeweight against excesses of radicalism and Bolshevikism” in the industrial centers. Whatever happens to Germany, concludes The Tribune, the end of the war will see Central Europe turned into a vast proving-ground for the democratic experiment."